



**Town of Arlington, Massachusetts**  
**730 Massachusetts Ave., Arlington, MA 02476**  
**Phone: 781-316-3000**

**webmaster@town.arlington.ma.us**

## Capital Planning Minutes 11-29-2001

Meeting Memorandum  
 November 29, 2001

In attendance were:

- \* Steve Andrew
- John Bilafer
- John FitzMaurice
- Charles T. Foskett, Chairman
- Nancy T. Galkowski
- Dave Kale
- Anthony T. Lionetta
- \* A. L. Minervini
- \* Barbara Thornton

Also in attendance were K. Donovan, Superintendent of Schools, John Maher and Alan. McClennen.

\*Denotes those not in attendance.

1. Meeting Minutes: Minutes of the November 15, 2001 meeting were approved.

2. School Requests: K. Donovan reviewed requests with Committee. She noted that AHS Roof (\$150,000) and Repointing (\$150,000) may be eligible for SBAB reimbursement. SBAB now has set up separate accounts for Major Projects and for Repair Projects. While funds for Major Projects will likely be reduced next year, she understands, that there still should be a reasonable amount set aside for Repair Projects. However, there is a question whether both would make the reimbursement list in the same year. The Painting request will be dropped. She understands the CPC position that painting is not a capital item.

3. Requests for Completed Schools. There are several requests for schools, which have been completed. She noted that these are requested because construction budgets were exceeded and these items of work were deleted. The CPC noted its concern over the apparent practice of coming back to the Capital Plan to cover shortfalls and/or poor management of the program. Relative to the work at Hardy School, she noted that she would have reallocated costs (say from computers), if she had been made aware of the problem sooner. The CPC noted that she should consider withdrawing this years request for computers (\$125,000) to cover these new additional building costs. She agreed to do this.

4. School Program Management. Members of the CPC again stated their concern over the cost overruns on school projects. Concerns were expressed over the School Departments approach to build to the so-called "Brackett" Standard. Charlie F. and Tony L. again recommended the use of a Construction Manager on projects. She noted that she may consider this on future projects. Apparently, SBAB will give extra consideration for the use of CMs.

5. Comparative Analysis Requested: Tony L. requested that K. Donovan provide statistics on construction program \$\$ spent on a per pupil basis for each of the Towns schools. Also requested is information \$ /per pupil spent by other communities. She agreed to provide this information.

6. Field House. The School Dept wants money for a proposed Field House. The Field House would be located on the old practice field that is currently fenced off. Kay D., John M. and Alan M. explained the "Deal" in relation to the clean up of the High School Property. Private parties have agreed to clean up the entire area. (limits go well beyond the practice field) The estimated cost of clean up (at this time) is \$6,000,000 plus a \$1,200,000 contingency. Private parties have agreed to "gift" the Town

\$2,670,000 towards a Field House. The result is that private parties have agreed to put a total of \$9,870,000 into the project. About \$200,000 of the clean-up costs will go towards the foundation of the Field House, which will be used to cap / seal contaminated materials in this area. The estimated cost for the Field House is close to \$8,000,000 (Option B on provided cost handout). The gift goes towards this sum leaving a balance of \$5,330,000 to be paid for by the Town (and private donations). However the "Deal" requires that the Town spend the funds for the field house before the private parties will reimburse. They also noted that if costs exceed the \$7,200,000, there will be a need to sit down and renegotiate. Tony L. noted that this "Deal" seems to leave the Town exposed to paying money for the clean up, after already funding the cost of the Field House. John M. noted that Town Meeting had already voted this "Deal".

7. Field Remediation: Alan M. explained the method of remediation. The contamination is over most of the field area, as well as portions of the Public Works Yard. In general, the program calls for removing 2 feet of contaminated material in the fields, replacing it with new clean material and then adding 1 foot of additional new material so that remaining contaminated materials still in place are covered by at least 3 feet of clean material. An engineered barrier may be used in certain areas. The end result is that the field area will be raised by 1 foot. The work will take about 18 months to complete. CPC asked about the sequencing of work. This has not yet been determined, however the School Department would like the Field House built upfront to 1) secure its construction and, 2) use it to offset the loss of the out of commission fields. (As another alternative to the latter, John F. noted that the Reeds Project, with its new fields, may be done in time to offset some of the time the fields will be out of commission) It is understood that the fields, tennis courts and other surfaces disturbed by the project would be restored by the project. The contractor would be under contract with the private concerns, but the Town would have an observer in the field to protect its interests.

8. Additional Questions/Concerns of CPC on Field House Proposal: Tony L. questioned the logic of taking the money for the field house upfront and then possibly having to spend more Town money, if costs exceed the projected \$7,200,000. Charlie F. questioned if construction of the Field House could be postponed a few years. The foundation could be built and the building constructed at a later date, say FY 04, when financing the project, could be more easily taken on by the Capital Plan. He questioned the contractual strength of arrangement and why this would not be acceptable. Dave K agreed to check into whether the \$500,000 for design fees could be paid by the "Deal" as part of the \$2,670,000 gift instead of by the CPC. Tony L. questioned whether restoration would include new Bleachers (Home side), irrigation, lighting and so on. Dave K agreed to check into this.

9. CPC's review of School Requests: CPC decisions on School Department requests other than the Field House are as follows:

Photo Copier	Keep at \$80,000 per year.
Painting	Denied, All years
AHS Roof	Moved to FY 2004
Ottoson Signage	Denied
Air Conditioners	At \$7500/year
Ottoson Telephone	New Request will be reduced significantly (Dave to get back)
Hardy Repairs	Dave to get more info. (Maybe if offset by PCs)
Irrigation	Denied
Ottoson Doors	Denied

Next Meeting: The next meeting of the CPC will be December 11 at 4pm. The CPC will also meet on December 13 as scheduled.